



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,556	08/25/2000	Bernward Scholkens	02481.1702	3278

22852 7590 04/09/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BAHAR, MOJDEH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED

APR 14 2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Docketed 44403 Attorney RCN/SS
Case 2481.1702
Due Date 7-9-03
Action RESPONSE
By [Signature]

Office Action Summary	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/645,556	SCHOLKENS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mojdeh Bahar	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 6-7, 18-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 6, 7, 18 and 19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>16</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 27, 2003 has been entered.

Applicant's arguments and amendment are persuasive to remove the rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103 in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4, 6-7 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Neither the claims nor the specification enables the skilled artisan to totally "prevent" chronic heart failure. The application does not provide any examples in which the occurrence of chronic heart failure has been absolutely prevented. One of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to totally prevent the occurrence of chronic heart failure. The substitution of "reducing the risk of onset/occurrence" for "preventing" would be favorably considered. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1617

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4, 6-7 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to ascertain the characteristics of a host with "essentially maintained heart function". Does a hypertensive host have "essentially maintained heart function"? A hypotensive patient? A patient with hyperlipidemia? The metes and bounds of these claims are not clear. The skilled artisan cannot ascertain the populations encompassed by people with "essentially maintained heart function".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action: //

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold et al. (4,587,258) in view of The Merck Manual:

Art Unit: 1617

Gold et al. teaches a method of treating hypertension and CHF through the administration of ACE inhibitors (e.g., ramipril) see abstract and claims in particular.

Gold et al. (4,587,258) does not particularly teach the administration of ACE inhibitors in a method of preventing CHF.

The Merck Manual teaches hypertension as one of the causes of CHF, see page 93.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an ACE inhibitor in a method of preventing CHF.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ an ACE inhibitor in a method of controlling/treating hypertension, an underlying cause of CHF, thereby preventing the onset of CHF.

Claims 6-7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold et al. and The Merck Manual as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of MacLaughlan et al. (WO 96/24373).

MacLaughlan et al. (WO 96/24373) discloses pharmaceutical compositions comprising ACE inhibitors generally and alacepril, benazepril, captopril, cilazapril, delapril, enalapril, enalaprilat, fosinopril, fosinoprilat, imidapril, lisinopril, prindopril, quinapril, ramipril, temocapril,trandolapril, ceranapril, moexipril, quinaprilat, spriapril, see particularly claims 1-5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ any ACE inhibitor in a method of preventing CHF.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ any ACE inhibitor (e.g., those taught by MacLaughlan) in a method of controlling/treating hypertension, an underlying cause of CHF, thereby preventing the onset of CHF.

Art Unit: 1617

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al.

Allen et al. teaches a method of favorably affecting vascular disease by administering the ACE inhibitor, ramipril to normotensive subjects, see abstract.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendment canceling claims 10-13, 16-17 is persuasive to remove the rejection under 35 USC 103. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4,6-7 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mojdeh Bahar whose telephone number is (703) 305-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on (703) 305-1007 on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.


Mojdeh Bahar
Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 09/645,556

Page 6

Art Unit: 1617

March 31, 2003



SREENI PADMANABHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

4/7/03

Notic of References Cited	Application/Control No. 09/645,556	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination SCHOLKENS ET AL.	
	Examiner Mojdeh Bahar	Art Unit 1617	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-4,587,258	05-1986	Gold, et al.	
	B	US-			
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	Allen et al., Diabetic vascular hypertrophy and albuminuria: effect of ACE inhibition, abstract, PMID 8573756, 1995.
	V	Berkow et al. The Merck Manual (Home Ed.), 1997, p. 93.
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
 Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

Mujd K
 01/12/97

TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant's

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION

OMB No. 0651-0011

Pat. Docket No. 02481.1702-00

Applicant Bernard Schölkens et al.

Serial No. 09/645,556

Filing Date August 25, 2000

Group: 1617

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

Cashin-Hemphill et al., "Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibition as Antiatherosclerotic Therapy:"
No Answer Yet," Am. J. Cardiol., vol. 83, pp. 43-47 (1999)

Examiner

*Examiner:

Date Considered

03/31/03

Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Form PTO 1449

Patent and Trademark Office - U.S. Department of Commerce

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900